

REMARKS

The specification of the present application has been amended to correct a minor translational error. Specifically, the term "subscriber line" has been replaced with the term "subscriber terminal" which is a more precise translation of the original German term "Teilnehmeranschluss." Given the numerous times in which such term appears in the specification, Applicants are herein submitting a complete substitute specification with the corrected terms.

Claims 1-10 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 3-10 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 of the present application under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In light of the amendments to the specification as outlined in this Amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that such rejection has been obviated.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6, 7 and 10 of the present application under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, stating that the term "a further first subscriber line" is used by the claims to mean "a third subscriber line," and that such term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the terms "first subscriber line" and "second subscriber line" are, in fact, clearly defined in the specification as secretary lines and manager lines, respectively (see, e.g., paragraph 1 of the detailed description). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the associated rejection is unwarranted and respectfully request that it be withdrawn at this time.

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected, in particular, independent claim 1 of the present application under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Erb (US Patent No. 6,130,938), an under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Harlow et al. (US Patent 5,206,901). For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections and request withdrawal of same.

First of all, Applicants respectfully submit that the issue addressed by the present invention, that of reliable call forwarding or redirection in multi-PBX environments, is not taught or suggested by either the Erb or Harlow references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully

submit that it is erroneous to refer to these references, either alone or in combination with each other, as a basis for anticipating or obviating the presently claimed invention.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Erb nor Harlow references teach or suggest a step of "storing the call redirection information in a memory associated with the second subscriber terminal and setting up the call redirection based on a result of the step of checking." Indeed, the Erb reference discloses that the associated call redirection information is stored in a memory associated with a *private branch exchange* rather than with an individual subscriber terminal as per the claimed invention (see, for example, column 2, lines 31-41). Similarly, the Harlow reference discloses the use of a *shared data base* for storing call redirection information rather than with an individual subscriber terminal as per the claimed invention (see, for example, column 4, lines 47-54).

Applicants respectfully submit that the above differences are relatively significant. According to the claimed invention, call redirection information still can be addressed and accessed reliably, even if a first subscriber terminal is not connected to the same private branch exchange as a second subscriber terminal. By storing call redirection information directly in a memory associated with the second subscriber terminal, it is possible to provide cross-coverage of the respective areas of different private branch exchanges in consideration of the subscriber terminals which are respectively connected thereto.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 of the present application, as amended, as well as claims 3-10 which respectfully depend therefrom, are both novel and non-obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicant acknowledges that a two-month extension of time of \$220.00 is due in connection with this response at this time. A check for such amount is enclosed herewith. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the office is hereby authorized to deduct said fees from Deposit Account No.: 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (0112740-694) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

William E. Vaughan

Reg. No. 39,056

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4292

Dated: December 29, 2003